Remarks

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9, 11, 14, 19-22, 30-41, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,742,143 to Kaler, et al. ("Kaler") in view of U.S. Patent Publication 20020083217 to Ward, et al. ("Ward"). The Examiner also rejected claims 10, 12-13, 23-26, 27-29, 42, and 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kaler. The Examiner also rejected claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 10, 11, 15, 19, 23, 25-28, 30, 39, and 43. Applicants have also added new claims 46-50. Applicants have also canceled claims 21-22. Accordingly, claims 1-20 and 23-50 will be pending after entry of this Amendment.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-9

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler in view of Ward. Claims 2-9 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1. Claim 1 recites a method. For an event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application, the method creates an event object. The event object occupies a memory space that is independent of the application. The method logs within the event object a start time, end time, and information regarding the event. The method reviews at least one of said start time, end time, and information regarding the event. The creating, logging, and reviewing are performed on a single computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not render claim 1 unpatentable. For instance, the cited references do not disclose creating, logging, and reviewing on one computer, as recited in the claim. The Office Action cited Kaler as disclosing the event object creation and logging on one computer. However, Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where an in-process event creator ("IEC") collects occurrences on

one computer and a VSA logs those occurrences in another computer. Specifically, Kaler states that the IEC monitors an execution process for occurrences and, when these occurrences occur, store them in a memory buffer. *See* Kaler, column 12, lines 29-32. Kaler further states that when a user's specified trigger condition is detected, a local event concentrator ("LEC") transmits all of the buffered events to the VSA for logging. *See Id.*, column 22, lines 23-25; *see also*, Fig. 22A. Hence, Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where the creation of these occurrences, logging, and reviewing are performed on different computers, and not on one computer.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 1 unpatentable. As claims 2-9 are dependent on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-9 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 1.

II. Rejection of Claims 10-18

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 10 under §102(e) as being anticipated by Kaler. Claims 11-18 depend directly or indirectly on claim 10. Claim 10 recites a computer that includes a computer readable storage. The computer readable storage stores a foundational layer upon which applications are built or executed. The computer readable storage stores an event logging mechanism created by the foundational layer. The event logging mechanism executes independently of the applications. The mechanism is for identifying a set of events for an application executing on the foundational layer, generating an event log, and analyzing the event log. The event log is generated without referencing any event logs of the application. Each of the events is designated an enabled/disabled status. A disabled status disables all logging for an event. The event logging mechanism performs the identifying, generating, and analyzing on the computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kaler does not anticipate claim 10 for at least the following reasons. For instance, Kaler does not disclose an event logging mechanism that performs the identifying, generating, and analyzing on a computer, as recited in claim 10. Instead, Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where an IEC collects occurrences on one computer and a VSA logs those occurrences in another computer. *See* Kaler, column 11, lines 23-34; *see also*, Fig. 2. Specifically, Kaler states that when a user's specified trigger condition is detected, the LEC transmits all of the buffered events to the VSA for logging. *See Id.*, column 22, lines 23-25; *see also*, Fig. 22A. Hence, Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where the creation of these occurrences, logging, and analyzing are performed by several mechanisms on different computers.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kaler does not render claim 10 unpatentable. As claims 11-18 are dependent on claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-18 are patentable over Kaler for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 10. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10-18.

III. Rejection of Claims 19, 20, and 30-38

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 19 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler in view of Ward. Claim 20 is dependent directly on claim 19. Claim 19 recites an article that includes a computer readable medium storing a computer program for execution by at least one processor. The computer program has a set of instructions which when executed causes creates an event object for an event to be logged that has not yet been logged within an application. The event object occupies a memory space that is independent of the application. The computer program has a set of instructions for loggings within the event object a start time,

end time, and information regarding the event. The creating and said logging are performed on a single computer on which said application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not render claim 19 unpatentable. For instance, the cited references do not disclose performing event object creation and logging on a single computer. The Office Action cited Kaler as disclosing the event object creation and logging on one computer. Instead, Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where an IEC collects occurrences on one computer and a VSA logs those occurrences in another computer. *See* Kaler, column 11, lines 23-34; *see also*, Fig. 2. Specifically, Kaler states that when a user's specified trigger condition is detected, the LEC transmits all of the buffered events to the VSA for logging. *See Id.*, column 22, lines 23-25; *see also*, Fig. 22A. Hence, Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where the creation of these occurrences and logging are performed by several mechanisms on different computers.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 19 unpatentable. As claim 20 is dependent on claim 19, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 19. Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claim 30 under a similar rationale as claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 30 and all its dependent claims, namely claims 31-38 are patentable over the cited reference for reasons similar to those as discussed above for claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 19, 20, and 30-38.

IV. Rejection of claim Claims 23-29

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 23 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kaler. Claims 24-29 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 23. Claim 23 recites a computer that includes computer readable storage. The computer readable storage is for storing a

foundational layer upon which applications are executed. The computer readable storage is for storing an event-logging mechanism for execution on said foundational. The mechanism executes independently of the applications. The mechanism is for identifying a set of events for an application executing on the foundational layer. The mechanism is for generating an event log for display in a web browser. The event log is generated without referencing any event logs of the application. The event-logging mechanism performs the identifying and generating on the computer on which the application executes.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kaler does not anticipate claim 23 for at least the following reasons. *First*, Kaler does not disclose identifying a set of events and generating an event log on one computer. Instead, Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where an IEC collects occurrences on one computer and a VSA logs those occurrences in another computer. *See* Kaler, column 11, lines 23-34; *see also*, Fig. 2. Specifically, Kaler states that when a user's specified trigger condition is detected, the LEC transmits all of the buffered events to the VSA for logging. *See Id.*, column 22, lines 23-25; *see also*, Fig. 22A. Hence, Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where the creation of these occurrences and logging are performed by several mechanisms on different computers.

Second, Kaler does not disclose a mechanism that generates an event log for display in a web browser. Instead, Kaler describes occurrences that are displayed in a control station which is not a web browser. *See* Kaler, Fig. 19.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kaler does not render claim 23 unpatentable. As claims 24-29 are dependent on claim 23, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24-29 are patentable over Kaler for at least the reasons that were discussed above in relation to claim 23. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23-29.

V. Rejection of Claim 39-41

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 39 under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaler in view of Ward. Claims 40 and 41 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 39. Claim 39 recites a method. For an event to be logged that has not yet been logged with an application, the method identifies a set of events generated by the application. The method hierarchically logs the identified set of events. At least one event in the hierarchy includes a sub-event. The identifying and logging are performed on a single computer on which the application executes.

For at least two reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not render claim 39 unpatentable. *First*, for reasons similar to those as discussed above for claim 1, the cited references do not disclose a method that identifies and logs a set of events on a single computer.

Second, the cited references do not disclose hierarchically logging an identified set of events where at least one event includes a sub event. Kaler's event refers to a particular time when something occurred. Hence, Kaler's event cannot include another sub event. Similarly, Ward fails to disclose the hierarchically logging that is recited in the claim. Ward mentions recording the time when a graphic application issues a function call. *See* Ward, page 7, paragraph 73. However, like Kaler, Ward also fails to disclose hierarchically logging a set of events where an event includes a sub event. As such, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose hierarchically logging, as recited in the claim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 39 unpatentable. As claims 40 and 41 are dependent on claim 39, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 40 and 41 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were

discussed above in relation to claim 39. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 39-41.

VI. Rejection of Claim 42-45

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 42 under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kaler. Claims 43-45 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 42. Claim 42 recites a computer that includes a storage. The storage is for a foundational layer upon which applications are executed. The storage is for an event-logging mechanism for execution on the foundational layer and for functioning interoperably with but separately from the applications. The mechanism is for identifying a set of event data for an application executing on the foundational layer, generating an event log to record the identified event data, and analyzing the event data, where the application does not generate an event log.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kaler does not anticipate claim 42 for at least the following reasons. For instance, Kaler does not disclose a mechanism for identifying a set of event data for an application executing on the foundational layer, generating an event log to record the identified event data, and analyzing the event data. Instead, Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where an in-process event creator ("IEC") collects occurrences on one computer, and a VSA logs and analyzes those occurrences in another computer. *See* Kaler, column 11, lines 23-34; *see also*, column 33, lines 25-27. Hence, Kaler discloses a distributed computing system where the creation of these occurrences, and logging and analyzing are performed by different mechanisms (i.e., IEC and VSA).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Kaler does not render claim 42 unpatentable. As claims 43-45 are dependent on claim 42, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 43-45 are patentable over Kaler for at least the reasons that were discussed above in

relation to claim 42. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 43-45.

VI. New Claims

In this Supplemental Amendment, Applicants have added claims 46-50. Applicants respectfully submit that the new claims are fully supported by the disclosure and are patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims, namely claims 1-20 and 23-50 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Applicants have submitted any necessary fees for additional claims. Applicants believe that no additional fee is required for the submission of this supplemental amendment. However, in the unlikely event that the Commissioner determines that additional fee, extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time. Moreover, Applicants authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 50-3804** referencing **APLE.P0005**.

Respectfully submitted,

ADELI & TOLLEN LLP

Dated: May 15, 2008

/Bum Pak/
Bum Pak
Reg. No. 56,916

Adeli & Tollen LLP
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1360
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2514
Phone: (310) 785-0140 x305
Fax: (310) 785-9558